

MINUTES OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
AIR QUALITY TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Thursday, November 8, 2001  
MAG Office  
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS PRESENT

Stephen Cleveland, City of Goodyear, Chairman  
Scottsdale: Larry Person  
Chandler: Jim Weiss

\*Gilbert: Danielle Typinski

Glendale: Doug Kukino

Mesa: Christine Zielonka

Phoenix: Gaye Knight

Tempe: Tom Moore

Citizen Representative: Phil Noplos for Walter  
Bouchard

Arizona Lung Association: David Feuerherd

Salt River Project: Greg Witherspoon

Southwest Gas Corporation: Brian O'Donnell

\*Arizona Public Service Company: Scott Davis

\*Western States Petroleum Association: Gina Grey

Regional Public Transportation Authority: Randi

Alcott for Bryan Jungwirth

\*Arizona Motor Transport Association: Dave Berry

\*Maricopa County Farm Bureau: Jeannette Fish

\*Arizona Rock Products Association: Samuel  
Aubrey

\*Associated General Contractors: David Martin

\*Homebuilders Association of Central Arizona:

Connie Wilhelm-Garcia

American Institute of Architects- Central Arizona:

H. Maynard Blumer

Valley Forward: Peter Allard

\*University of Arizona - Cooperative Extension:

Monica Pastor

Arizona Department of Transportation: Sandra

Gilbert for Pat Cupell

Arizona Department of Environmental Quality:

Peter Hyde

Maricopa County Environmental Services

Department: Jo Crumbaker

Arizona Department of Weights and Measures: Mark

Ellery

Federal Highway Administration: Dennis Mittelstedt

\*Arizona State University: Judi Nelson

Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community:

Stan Belone for B. Bobby Ramirez

\*Citizen Representative: David Rueckert

\*Phoenix Chamber of Commerce: Ian Calkins

\*Those members were neither present nor represented by proxy.

OTHERS PRESENT

Doug Collins, Maricopa Association of  
Governments

Cathy Arthur, Maricopa Association of  
Governments

Dean Giles, Maricopa Association of  
Governments

Bill Buck, Arizona Auto Hobbyist Council

Beverly Chenausky, Arizona Department of  
Transportation

Bryant Powell, City of Apache Junction

Kayelen Corley, Arizona Department of  
Administration

Lindy Bauer, Maricopa Association of Governments

Jean Parkinson, Pinal County Air Quality Control  
District

Charlie Stevens, Western States Petroleum  
Association

Theresa Pella, Arizona Department of Environmental  
Quality

Corky Martinkovic, Arizona Department of  
Environmental Quality

Miryam Gutier, City of Surprise

1. Call to Order

A meeting of the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee was conducted on November 8, 2001. Stephen Cleveland, City of Goodyear, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

2. Approval of the October 4, 2001 Meeting Minutes

The Committee reviewed the minutes from the October 4, 2001 meeting. Christine Zielonka, City of Mesa, requested a correction to the October 4, 2001 minutes to indicate that she, not Gaye Knight, initiated discussion on the Capitol Rideshare Program. Gaye Knight, City of Phoenix, moved, and Jim Weiss, City of Chandler, seconded, and the motion to approve the October 4, 2001 meeting minutes carried unanimously.

5. Status Report on the Use of the Regional Videoconferencing System for Future MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee Meetings

This item was presented out of order.

Heidi Pahl, Maricopa Association of Governments, provided a demonstration of the Regional Videoconferencing System from a remote location using the videoconferencing system. She mentioned work to the regional videoconferencing system to link all member agencies was nearly complete. Ms. Pahl noted that the videoconferencing system has been a valuable asset to several municipalities in the region to reduce both vehicle trips and travel expenses. For example, instead of traveling out-of-state for a business meeting, the Town of Gilbert used the videoconferencing system which enabled more employees to participate in the meeting. Ms. Pahl indicated that each videoconferencing system site has a coordinator that serves as the main point of contact to schedule and assist in a videoconference.

Ms. Pahl informed the Committee about the marketing plan to educate MAG member agencies, MAG stakeholders, and the general public on the availability and use of the videoconferencing system. She thanked those who have made the videoconferencing system possible including the MAG Telecommunications Advisory Group representatives and the site coordinators. In addition, Ms. Pahl indicated that if any MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee representative would like to attend Committee meetings in the future using the videoconferencing system, to please contact her. Mr. Cleveland thanked Ms. Pahl for the presentation.

3. Evaluation of Proposed CMAQ Projects for the FY 2003-2007 MAG TIP

Cathy Arthur, Maricopa Association of Governments, briefed the Committee on the process that followed the October 4, 2001 Committee recommendation on the ranking of Air Quality projects proposed for Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) funds for the FY 2003-2007 MAG Transportation Improvement Program. She indicated that it was anticipated the Transportation Review Committee (TRC) would provide guidance on the division of the available funding for each modal and technical Committee. However, on November 6, 2001 the TRC

recommended that all projects be referred back to the modal committees to look at the rankings again and reconsider the CMAQ and Congestion Management System (CMS) scores.

Ms. Arthur mentioned that at the TRC meeting, MAG staff presented a recommendation on funding levels by mode. She noted that the \$3.2 million presented in the table for “Air Quality” projects at the TRC meeting was not accurate and the TRC was informed that the correct number was \$4.3 million. Ms. Arthur indicated that the Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee “Air Quality” project recommendations from the October 4, 2001 meeting were provided at their places. She mentioned that several projects in the table had been clarified by noting that the funding was contracted through MAG.

Ms. Arthur indicated this agenda item was for information, discussion, and recommendation on the ranked “Air Quality” projects for funding to the Transportation Review Committee for the December 11, 2001 meeting. Larry Person, City of Scottsdale, inquired why there were no CMS scores for “Air Quality” projects. Ms. Arthur responded that the “Air Quality” projects have been evaluated based on CMAQ scores. She noted that projects with lower values for total cost-effectiveness provide the most benefit. Ms. Zielonka indicated that she was concerned about the emissions reduction on the pilot project. She requested information on the emissions reduction and methodology. Ms. Arthur replied she would provide the methodology used to calculate the emissions reduction and cost effectiveness for the pilot project. Brian O’Donnell, Southwest Gas Corporation, asked for clarification on why the projects were sent back to the Committee by the TRC since the projects previously ranked by the Committee were in order of total cost-effectiveness. Ms. Arthur responded that only some of the modal committees were affected.

Ms. Knight indicated the Committee should reconsider the entire list and that she would support funding for the Capitol Rideshare Program. Mr. Cleveland mentioned that all projects would be put back into the hopper, and that projects would be evaluated in terms of cost-effectiveness. He noted the Committee should apply the criteria for prioritizing the projects and then if there are any exceptions, show the viability and merits of the project. Maynard Blumer, American Institute of Architects, asked about the project selection process. Lindy Bauer, Maricopa Association of Governments, responded that originally, it was anticipated this Committee would receive information today on funding from the TRC. She added that the priority ranking previously recommended by the Committee on October 4, 2001 could be modified.

Mr. Cleveland introduced Kayelen Corley, Arizona Department of Administration, who provided a summary of the services provided by the Capitol Rideshare Program. Ms. Corley indicated the Program began in 1982 and that MAG has been a long-time supporter. She mentioned the State of Arizona is the largest employer and the Capitol Rideshare Program serves over 100 state agencies, boards, and commissions. The Capitol Rideshare Program continues to be on the leading edge in developing programs and packaging them for the Regional Public Transportation Authority for regional application. Ms. Corley also mentioned the telecommuting and Commuter Club programs.

Mr. O’Donnell asked how the funding was used. Ms. Corley replied that half of the funding is used for bus subsidies and that the \$135,000 in federal aid affords slightly more than two full-time equivalent positions for the Capitol Rideshare Program. Mr. Blumer indicated that the Committee

could use a ratio based on the estimated federal amount. Ms. Knight clarified that given a hypothetical 25 percent reduction in federal aid funding, all “Air Quality” projects would receive an across the board reduction of 25 percent.

Ms. Knight moved that the Capitol Rideshare Program be placed back into the list of projects to be funded. Ms. Arthur indicated the project would be ranked third in terms of total cost-effectiveness. Mr. Cleveland asked about funding for the demonstration project. Ms. Knight indicated the city did not apply for the project, but that Tempe and Mesa spearheaded the project together to address pollution by retrofitting municipal vehicles. Ms. Bauer mentioned that the project is a proactive approach to reduce pollution. Dennis Mittelstedt, Federal Highway Administration, asked for a brief project description. Ms. Zielonka informed the Committee that the pilot project is to install and evaluate the effectiveness of particulate filters and oxidation catalysts on municipal heavy duty diesel vehicles and to establish temporary low sulfur diesel fuel and biodiesel fuel facilities.

Mr. O’Donnell mentioned that other conversions he was familiar with were subject to continual maintenance. Ms. Zielonka noted that others have had excellent results with a 98 percent reduction and that maintenance was not a problem for post-1995 vehicles. Mr. O’Donnell indicated that for electric generating engines, maintenance was expensive at two to three cents per kilowatt hour. Tom Moore, City of Tempe, suggested that the pilot project could leverage Environmental Protection Agency funds for a workshop intended to educate the public, especially fleet managers, on pollution control technologies.

Ms. Arthur, in response to an earlier question on CMS scores, clarified that CMS scores are not calculated for projects that are regional, such as the “Air Quality” projects. Mr. Cleveland requested that footnote three be revised to indicate why no CMS scores are given. Ms. Arthur replied the footnote would be changed. Mr. Person asked why the emissions reduction is identical for both the Capitol Rideshare and Regional Rideshare Programs. Ms. Arthur indicated she would review the calculation, and report back to the Committee.

Mr. Cleveland asked the Committee how it wanted to proceed. Mr. Blumer mentioned that the Committee does not know the funding level. Mr. Cleveland indicated that the projects being prioritized today are for FY 2007 - six years from now. He mentioned that if a project is in the pipeline, it can be moved forward. Ms. Zielonka inquired about the process for funding street sweepers. Ms. Bauer clarified that funding being considered today is for FY 2007 funding of PM-10 certified street sweepers. A different process to prioritize specific PM-10 certified street sweeper project requests submitted by the municipalities for FY 2002 CMAQ funding was considered by this Committee on October 4, 2001.

Randi Alcott, Regional Public Transportation Authority, moved to rank the Capitol Rideshare Program as the seventh project on the project list. Doug Kukino, City of Glendale seconded. In further discussion on the motion, Mr. O’Donnell indicated he did not realize the program promoted bus use by giving subsidies to state employees and would prefer to see it ranked higher on the project list. Jim Weiss, City of Chandler, noted that this issue is a focused process and that he concurs with

placing the project on the bottom of the list. The motion was approved to place the Capitol Rideshare Program on the list, as project number seven.

Mr. Cleveland ask the Committee where the clean fuel pilot project should be on the list. A motion was made, seconded by Mr. Person, to rank the pilot project second on the list. Discussion continued on the motion with Mr. Moore indicating the opportunity to leverage EPA efforts to organize workshops. Mr. Blumer indicated he was against the motion on the floor and in order to keep project priorities consistent with CMAQ scores, the pilot project should be placed at the top of the list. Ms. Alcott indicated that based on the project cost-effectiveness, it should not be ranked second. Mr. O'Donnell mentioned that automobile manufacturers are conducting work on fuel cells and by 2007 will not be working with diesel. Ms. Zielonka indicated that the pilot project addresses existing municipal heavy duty diesel vehicles each with a remaining useful life of ten to twenty years. The motion to rank the pilot project second on the "Air Quality" projects list was approved.

Mr. Cleveland then requested a motion from the Committee to forward the recommendation to the TRC. Ms. Zielonka moved, and Mr. Moore seconded, to forward the recommendation on the ranked "Air Quality" projects for funding to the MAG Transportation Review Committee for the December 11, 2001 meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Draft MAG PM-10 Efficient Street Sweeper Study

Doug Collins, Maricopa Association of Governments, presented the Draft MAG PM-10 Efficient Street Sweeper Study. He explained that a commitment by MAG to conduct a PM-10 Efficient Street Sweeper Study is in the Revised 1999 Serious Area State Implementation Plan. The purpose of the Study is to collect information on South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1186-certified and non-certified street sweepers. Sweeper information including operational characteristics and use of PM-10 efficient street sweepers was collected from sweeper manufacturers and from sweeper operators located in the Maricopa County Nonattainment Area and the South Coast area.

Mr. Collins summarized the information collected from outside agencies using PM-10 Efficient Sweepers. The results indicated that: outside agencies reported they primarily used regenerative sweepers; agencies had approximately three years of experience with PM-10 efficient sweepers; PM-10 efficient sweepers rated "very good" with few differences reported; there was some increase in purchase and maintenance costs; to research sweepers thoroughly; maintain five mile-per-hour sweeping speed for best results; and, to have a strong maintenance program. Mr. Collins also reported a summary of the survey results from 14 local agencies on the use of certified and non-certified sweepers.

Mr. Collins presented the report summary. First, aspects about sweeper availability, selection and cost were reviewed, including: 40 models were available as certified sweepers; certified sweepers were available in vacuum, regenerative, dry vacuum, and mechanical broom types; most sweepers used in the Valley were available as certified models; the capital cost ranges from one percent to two percent higher; and, there are possibilities to retrofit existing equipment. Second, sweeper operations and maintenance issues were covered, including: overall certified and non-certified sweepers have

similar operating and maintenance requirements and abilities; maintenance costs reported to run higher for some certified sweepers; and, some agencies reported an increase in daily clean up time for regenerative sweepers. Third, points about the operation of certified street sweepers were presented, including: operating sweepers at five miles per hour; the possibility of additional water needs for dust suppression; and, there may be additional requirements for material pick-up and dumping.

Mr. O'Donnell inquired about the difference between certified and non-certified street sweepers. Mr. Collins replied that certified sweepers meet South Coast Rule 1186 criteria for particulate pick-up and suppression of dust during the sweeping process. Mr. Collins noted a correction to the Draft MAG PM-10 Efficient Street Sweeper Study on page ES-7, paragraph one, line five. He indicated that a new paragraph should begin with the sentence "For the agencies...".

Ms. Knight reported that the City of Phoenix has experienced problems regarding dust plumes from new certified sweepers. Ms. Knight also complimented staff on the report. She added that it was not a simple task given the changes provided by member agencies on the direction of the study. Ms. Knight indicated that city maintenance staff were appreciative of the tables in the report. She mentioned that the operation of the certified sweepers is an added expense for the municipalities and that to keep the PM-10 equipment operating efficiently, some shifts have been reduced by 1 ½ hours to conduct maintenance. Peter Hyde, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, noted that in context to the CMAQ project evaluations, sweeper projects should include a two percent increase for capital costs. Mr. Person mentioned the importance of opportunities to upgrade sweeper equipment.

Ms. Knight moved, David Feuerherd, Arizona Lung Association, seconded, and the motion carried unanimously to recommend approval of the MAG PM-10 Efficient Street Sweeper Study to the MAG Management Committee.

## 6. Regional Haze

Theresa Pella, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, presented the Regional Haze Program options and the activities of the Western Regional Air Partnership. Ms. Pella summarized the Regional Haze history and background including the requirement in the Clean Air Act to protect federal Class I areas. She noted that the Grand Canyon Visibility Transport Commission was formed to advise the Environmental Protection Agency regarding strategies for protecting visual air quality on the Colorado Plateau. Ms. Pella mentioned that in 1999, the final rules for Regional Haze were issued by the EPA. Ms. Pella reviewed the pollutants contributing to regional haze, including: PM-2.5; PM-10; elemental and organic carbon; sulfur oxides; nitric oxides, carbon monoxide; and, ammonia.

Ms. Pella indicated that Regional Haze planning options are contained in 40 CFR Section 308 and Section 309. Ms. Pella reviewed the issues addressed by the Western Regional Air Partnership forums. She indicated that the Arizona stakeholder recommendations included the development of a 309 State Implementation Plan (SIP) by December 31, 2003. The SIP would include four Grand Canyon Visibility Transport Commission Class I areas and eight other Class I areas across Arizona.

She stated that if the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) was unable to include all Class I areas by December 31, 2003, the initial SIP submission would include the Grand Canyon Visibility Transport Commission areas; other areas would be submitted as expeditiously as possible. Ms. Pella indicated that a comprehensive work plan would be developed by ADEQ to assist agencies in determining the extent of involvement and resource needs. In addition, Ms. Pella briefed the Committee on legislative needs for Regional Haze in 2002, including: authority for a market trading program; authority to establish a mobile source emissions budget for attainment areas, if necessary to comply with the Regional Haze rule; and, authority to establish annual goals for emissions from fires.

Ms. Zielonka asked if the SIP submission would require control measures from the municipalities. Ms. Pella responded that the 309 SIP would include measures from the Grand Canyon Visibility Transport Commission and there would not be new measures. Mr. Moore indicated that there was a lot of technical work to be done; the Superstition Wilderness has not been studied. Ms. Bauer noted that MAG was a newcomer to the ADEQ Regional Haze Stakeholders Group. Ms. Bauer inquired how the 309 Regional Haze SIP would affect the nonattainment area. Ms. Pella responded that ADEQ has consulted with the Environmental Protection Agency and ADEQ was informed that the inclusion of mobile sources should not be necessary since the criteria pollutants are addressed in separate SIPs. Mr. Blumer asked about the advisory resources and who was doing the work. Ms. Pella replied that ADEQ has an open stakeholder list and meeting summaries are posted on the ADEQ website. She asked that anyone interested may contact Ms. Corky Martinkovic of ADEQ. Ms. Knight requested that the Committee be given periodic updates on development of the SIP.

7. Arizona Emissions Bank

Ms. Pella, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, presented information on the Arizona Emissions Bank. She indicated that the statutory authority for the Arizona Emissions Bank is from Arizona Revised Statutes Section 49-410. The emissions bank would allow for the use of emission reduction credits in the same nonattainment area, maintenance area, or modeling domain in which the surplus reduction was made. Ms. Pella noted that under the program, all surplus reductions must be permanent, quantifiable, and enforceable. Ms. Pella indicated that the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality will be a clearinghouse for sellers and buyers of emissions. She noted that ADEQ has been working with a stakeholders group to develop the proposed Arizona Administrative Code for the Arizona Emissions Bank.

Ms. Pella indicated that the notice of proposed rulemaking for the Arizona Emissions Bank was in June 2001. A public hearing was conducted for the proposed rule in July 2001, and the Governor's Regulatory Review Council received the final rule in September 2001. She indicated that approval was expected from the Governor's Regulatory Review Council in December 2001 or January 2002. Mr. Blumer questioned whether a sand and gravel operation, for example, could take advantage of the system by selling credits. Jo Crumbaker, Maricopa County Environmental Services Department, responded that the reduction must be a surplus to the SIP and that products with elastic demand would not be eligible. Mr. Kukino indicated his concern for neighborhood impacts from industrial

sources that choose to purchase credits for the air quality benefits. Ms. Crumbaker responded that typically credits are provided for the siting of a major new source.

8. Call to the Public

An opportunity was provided to members of the public to address the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee. Mr. Cleveland noted that the next Committee meeting was scheduled for December 13, 2001, if necessary.

9. Call for Future Agenda Items

Ms. Arthur mentioned that the total cost for air quality projects was \$4,354,049. In addition, Mr. Person requested that the emission reduction and cost-effectiveness on the Capitol Rideshare Program be updated prior to the MAG Transportation Review Committee consideration.